

REMARKS

Status of claims

- Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, and 19 are pending in this application.
- Claims 1, 8, and 16 are in independent form.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

• Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2008/0016233 A1 to *Schneider* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,976,090 to *Ben-Shaul*.

Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 16, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for rapid provision of a desired resource for a user in a data network.

The method includes providing, by the user, an intentional address naturally expressed in a rich language in a first line user interface connected to the data network in which the user can provide a unique address of a resource to establish connection to the resource, intentionally and in accordance with a desire of the user for intended resource delivery.

The method also includes implementing at least one layer for dynamic communication and handling on a computer server at a network context operator. The method further includes receiving, reading and processing those parts of the intentional address that the operator within the network context is able to read or handle prior to resource delivery in

order to uncover the intention of the user, through processing of the intentional address in accordance with user specific and query specific information as well as handling algorithms and set of prepositions.

Furthermore, the method includes establishing, by the at least one layer, a connection in the data network directly between the user and the unique address of the desired resource on the basis of the uncovered intention.

Schneider discusses a method for use in a web browser with automatic search functionality. “Automatic search functionality” means that the browser first looks for the specified address through DNS. If the specified resource cannot be resolved or is unavailable, an automatic search is performed. In order to avoid the automatic search, Schneider teaches how to append a valid domain (e.g., "keywordrouter.org") to any string that cannot be resolved through DNS, thus redirecting the unresolved string to a predefined resource (e.g., at "keywordrouter.org") for further processing. The predefined resource (e.g., at "keywordrouter.org") extracts the original input, and performs a desired request, for example a registration request, a search request, etc., based on the original input.

Paragraph 0114 of Schneider states:

For example, a browser having a search function receives a first domain name as input. Typically, the first domain name is forwarded to the search function after a failed DNS request. By generating an identifier that is a second domain name having the first domain name, the second domain name can act as a carrier/envelope to the first domain name. A DNS server (which can act as a proxy server and managed by an ISP, for example) can be adapted to resolve all such generated identifiers for the purpose of requesting (e.g., registering, searching, or resolving, etc.) at least a portion of the identifier. The DNS server can return an IP address of a network resource that is adapted to extract the first domain name from the second domain name. In this way, the activation of a search request after a failed DNS request can be avoided entirely, enabling a browser to be use domain names as both a navigation tool, search tool, and registration tool.

(It is noted that Paragraph 0114 of Schneider is similar to paragraph 0112, where only a keyword is input.)

The present invention does not append a domain name. If a domain name is missing from the address in a web browser providing automatic search functionality, then a search will be performed. If, on the other hand, a domain can be resolved from the rich language in the address field, then control is passed to the resolved resource for further processing.

There is nothing in Schneider that would induce a person having ordinary skill in the art to avoid redirecting unresolved address expressions to a resource (e.g., at "keywordrouter.org"). Indeed, this redirection is a basic precondition for the further teachings of Schneider. In particular, there is nothing in Schneider to use prepositions pre-pended to a domain as an alternative means for redirecting control to a resource for further parsing and handling.

The Examiner asserts that the use of prepositions is known from Ben-Shaul, and cites column 12, lines 25-35 of that patent. Applicant respectfully points out that Ben-Shaul uses the terms "... preposition at a predetermined time and preposition upon an occurrence of a predetermined event" (*Applicant's emphasis*). In both cases, "preposition" should be interpreted as "**pre-position**" meaning "pre-set" or "pre-configured". Ben-Shaul does not teach the use of a "preposition" in the sense of a "word that indicates the relationship between a noun or pronoun and other words in a sentence", such as the prepositions listed in Fig. 3 of the present application. In this respect Applicant notes that a rational underpinning is required per *KSR* to support the legal conclusion of obviousness:

... [R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. MPEP 2141.III, quoting *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007). (Emphasis added.)

To support Applicant's above comments pertaining to Ben-Shaul, Applicant points out that the cited column 12, lines 25-35, cites claim 17. From the context of claim 17, it is clear that it concerns "service attributes" as defined in Table 2 (column 19, lines 25-30):

A set of properties that parameterize the application of a certain service directive by defining the content to which it is applied, at what times it is applied, on what edge server's it is applied, and for which customers.

Ben-Shaul at column 41, lines 39-51 provides performance as a reason for why one might want to perform certain services only at certain predetermined times and/or events:

Using an extended transformation technique, the edge server is designed to incorporate extensions that define resource transformations that are performed at the edge server. For example, an edge server may employ an HTML- to-wireless-markup-language (WML) transformation procedure. Such a transformation avoids the need to generate and store all possible versions of resources in the origin server. However since HTML transformations requires the edge server to parse and modify incoming HTML resources, they might impact performance. Thus, profile editors preferably use this method cautiously, generally in cases where the content is transferred off-line, for example, in the prefetch operation.

Finally, how to set, or pre-position, the time and event attributes using a front edge interface is discussed in column 44, lines 14 -43:

Target time identifies time segments in which services are applicable. Using the front edge tool **86**, profile editors specify when each service directive should be applied. At the edge server **84**, a service directive is performed only if the event that triggered that service, e.g., a URL request, occurs within the specified timing segments. ...(etc)

The word "preposition" appears exactly four times in Ben-Shaul: In the two expressions cited above from column 12, lines 25-35, and in the exact same expressions in claim 17. Hence, to determine the meaning of "preposition" there is no way around seeking support in the description. It is hard to find (and Applicant cannot find) another reasonable explanation of the terms "preposition at a predetermined time" and "preposition upon an occurrence of a predetermined event" than the one given above. Hence, the expressions must be construed as "**pre-position**" of certain times and events in service attributes.

Ben-Shaul does not mention prepositions in the sense used in the present application. Further, there is no indication in Ben-Shaul, even if considered in view of Schneider, that would direct a person having ordinary skill in the art toward the present invention.

Accordingly, claim 1 is seen to be clearly allowable over Schneider and Ben-Shaul, whether considered either separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

Independent claims 8 and 16 recites features which are similar in many relevant respects to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, claims 8 and 16 are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 1.

The dependent claims

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Raymond A. DiPerna/
Raymond A. DiPerna
Attorney for Applicant
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 44063
Tel. No. (212) 708-1950